



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,173	04/11/2001	Jeffrey Jonathan Spurgat	11748/16	1523
7590	02/18/2009		EXAMINER	
John S. Paniaguas KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS Suite 1600 525 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60661				CHOWDHURY, AZIZUL Q
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/833,173	SPURGAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AZIZUL CHOUDHURY	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 24, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US Pat No: 6,697,944) in view of Wiser et al (US Pat No: 6, 868,403), hereafter referred to as Jones and Wiser, respectively.

1. With regards to claim 1, Jones teaches through Wiser a secure architecture for preventing copying of digital content by way of a computing platform, the secure

architecture comprising: a secure computing platform for receiving and storing encrypted or encoded digital content from the Internet and from a remote source of digital content (*Jones teaches a trusted PC connecting to the Internet/digital content provider server (remote source); see column 8, lines 19-25 and lines 40-67, Jones*) as well as storing local encrypted or encoded data, and processing said encrypted or encoded digital data (*Jones teaches the downloading (storing) of encrypted music and allowing for playback of the encrypted music by decrypting; see column 8, lines 62-65, Jones*), said computing platform including a host processor and a peripheral bus (*equivalent to USB in Jones' disclosure; see column 9, lines 41-52, Jones*), said computing platform configured to run audio or video playback application software for passing said encrypted or encoded digital data to said peripheral bus (*Jones teaches the PC having playback means for encrypted music; see column 9, lines 15-20 and column 10, lines 9-18, Jones*), a playback device including a separate content processor and a peripheral bus interface for receiving said encrypted or encoded digital content from said peripheral bus said content processor configured to decrypt and decode said encrypted or encoded digital content and control playback of said digital content by said playback device, said playback device also including a memory device for storing decoding or decryption software (*Jones teaches the portable device (playback device) having receiving encrypted music via USB (peripheral bus interface); see column 10, lines 9-18 and 28-32, Jones. Jones also teaches the playback device having decryption means or even having*

means to download decryption software (both equivalent to storing decryption software); see column 12, lines 30-47, Jones. The playback device is an mp3 player and it is implicit that an mp3 player has a content processor since it processes content; see column 12, lines 48-66, Jones), said playback device configured to decrypt or decode said encrypted or encoded digital data and generate a decoded or decrypted output signal for playback (Jones teaches the portable device decrypting the encrypted music; see column 12, lines 30-47, Jones), said playback device configured so that said decrypted or decoded digital content is inaccessible by said computing platform when said playback device is connected to said computing platform (see Wiser below).

While Jones' design teaches the use of digital content for providing music, Jones does not explicitly cite the computing platform being restricted from accessing decrypted or decoded digital content when the playback device is connected to it.

In the same field of endeavor, Wiser teaches a media player that connects to a host (column 3, lines 39-52, Wiser). The design features a media player (equivalent to the claimed playback device) with decryption means for purchased music. Wiser teaches how the purchased music can only be decrypted and played back on the specific media player and no other device (column 3, lines 39-52, Wiser). By having digital content only readable by a specific device, the seller of the digital content ensures copyright protections are not violated. It therefore would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Jones with those of Wiser to secure online music to avoid copyright infringements (see column 3, lines 2-11, Wiser).

2. With regards to claim 2, Jones teaches through Wiser the secure architecture, wherein said computing platform includes a network interface for receiving digital data from an external network (column 7, lines 38-40, Jones).
3. With regards to claim 3, Jones teaches through Wiser the secure architecture, wherein said peripheral bus is a USB bus (column 9, lines 37-53, Jones).
4. With regards to claim 4, Jones teaches through Wiser the secure architecture, wherein said peripheral bus is a PCI bus (column 9, lines 37-53, Jones).
5. With regards to claim 5, Jones teaches through Wiser the secure architecture, wherein said peripheral bus is a Fire Wire bus (Jones' design allows for the use of buses, it would have been obvious to have used a FireWire bus; column 9, lines 37-53, Jones).
6. With regards to claim 6, Jones teaches through Wiser the secure architecture further including one or more user input devices (Figure 1, elements 40 and 42, Jones).

7. With regards to claim 7, Jones teaches through Wiser the secure architecture, wherein said computing architecture includes one or more local persistent storage devices (Figure 1, elements 29 and 60, Jones).

8. With regards to claim 8, Jones teaches through Wiser a secure hardware architecture for preventing copying of digital content by way of a computing platform, the secure architecture comprising: a computing platform for receiving and storing encrypted or encoded digital content from the Internet as well as storing local encrypted or encoded data (*Jones teaches a trusted PC connecting to the Internet/digital content provider server; see column 8, lines 19-25 and lines 40-67, Jones*), and processing said encrypted or encoded digital data, said computing platform including a host processor and a peripheral bus, said computing platform configured to run audio or video playback application software for passing said encrypted or encoded digital data to said peripheral bus (*Jones teaches the downloading (storing) of encrypted music and allowing for playback of the encrypted music by decrypting; see column 8, lines 62-65, Jones*. *Jones also teaches USB (peripheral bus); see column 9, lines 41-52, Jones*); a playback device for receiving encrypted or encoded digital content from said computing platform, said playback device including a content processor and a peripheral bus interface, for receiving said encrypted or encoded digital content from said peripheral bus, said content processor configured to decrypt or decode said encrypted or encoded digital content, said playback device also including a

local memory device for storing decoding or decryption software, said content processor (*Jones teaches the portable device (playback device) having receiving encrypted music via USB (peripheral bus interface); see column 10, lines 9-18 and 28-32, Jones. Jones also teaches the playback device having decryption means or even having means to download decryption software (both equivalent to storing decryption software); see column 12, lines 30-47, Jones. The playback device is an mp3 player and it is implicit that an mp3 player has a content processor since it processes content; see column 12, lines 48-66, Jones*) also configured to create a list of decrypted or decoded digital content stored on said playback device (*Jones' disclosure teaches the listing of decrypted files; see column 12, line 65 - column 13, line 1, Jones*), wherein playback device is configured so that said decrypted and decoded digital content is inaccessible by said computing platform when said computing platform is connected to said playback device (see *Wiser below*).

While Jones' design teaches the use of digital content for providing music, Jones does not explicitly cite the computing platform being restricted from accessing decrypted or decoded digital content when the playback device is connected to it.

In the same field of endeavor, Wiser teaches a media player that connects to a host (column 3, lines 39-52, Wiser). The design features a media player (equivalent to the claimed playback device) with decryption means for purchased music. Wiser teaches how the purchased music can only be decrypted and

played back on the specific media player and no other device (column 3, lines 39-52, Wiser). By having digital content only readable by a specific device, the seller of the digital content ensures copyright protections are not violated. It therefore would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Jones with those of Wiser to secure online music to avoid copyright infringements (see column 3, lines 2-11, Wiser).

9. With regards to claim 9, Jones teaches through Wiser, the secure architecture, wherein said playback device is further configured to enable editing of said list (*Wiser teaches the organizing of play lists (equivalent to the claimed editing of list); see column 10, lines 7-13, Wiser*).
10. The obviousness motivation applied to claims 1 and 8 are applicable to their respective dependent claims.

Response to Remarks

The amendment received on November 24, 2008 has been carefully examined but is not deemed fully persuasive. In lieu of the claim amendments, claim objection issued in the previous office action has been withdrawn. However, the amended claims do not overcome the previously issued 103. The following are the examiner's response to the applicant's argument.

The principle argument presented by the applicant concerns the claimed secure architecture for protecting decrypted digital content from unauthorized distribution without the need for relatively complicated software. The applicant contends that neither prior art teaches the protection of decrypted content from being distributed without the need of software. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *protecting decrypted digital content from unauthorized distribution without the need for relatively complicated software*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims only state that decrypted/decoded digital content is inaccessible by said computing platform when it is connected to the playback device. No mention is made concerning enabling such protection without any software. Furthermore, Wiser teaches how the purchased music can only be decrypted and played back on the specific media player (playback device) and no other device (column 3, lines 39-52, Wiser) (hence protection from unauthorized redistribution of decrypted content).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AZIZUL CHOUDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Azizul Choudhury/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445